1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
8	* * *		
9	JOHN TURNER,	Case No. 2:16-cv-02413-RFB-VCF	
10	Plaintiff,	ODDED	
11	v.	<u>ORDER</u>	
12	LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,		
13	Defendants.		
14			
15	Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 105] of		
16	the Honorable Cam Ferenbach, United States Magistrate Judge, entered January 22, 2019.		
17	A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or		
18	recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific		
19	written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C.		
20	§ 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is		

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct "any review," de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by February 5, 2019. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the Magistrate Judge's recommendations.

. . .

1	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 105]	
2	is ACCEPTED and ADOPTED in full.	
3	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants I. Fouquet, "D," the State of Nevada,	
4	Bonner, M. Gove, and P. Hernandez are DISMISSED from the case with prejudice.	
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Counts 4 and 9 of the First Amendment Complaint	
6	(ECF No. 104) are DISMISSED with prejudice.	
7	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 104) will	
8	proceed on Counts 1, 2 (as to G. Hoder and Diaz), 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8.	
9	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court issue summons to the remaining	
10	Defendants so Plaintiff's remaining claims may proceed.	
11	DATED: February 8, 2019	
12		
13	RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II	
14	United States District Judge	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
2526		
20 27		

28